

1

2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

4

5 DANIEL CISNEROS,  
6 Plaintiff,

7 v.

8 J. VANGILDER, et al.,  
9 Defendants.

AMENDED ORDER RELATING CASES;  
ADDRESSING REQUESTS FOR  
EXTENSIONS OF TIME

Case No. 16-cv-0735-HSG (PR)

Re: Dkt. No. 21, 28

10

11 BENDY A. FALLA,  
12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 C. DUCART, et al.,  
15 Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-0869-HSG (PR)

16

17 DANIEL MANRIQUEZ,  
18 Plaintiff,

19 v.

20 J. VANGIDLER, et al.,  
21 Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-1320-HSG (PR)

Re: Dkt. No. 18

22

23 OSCAR CHAIDEZ,  
24 Plaintiff,

25 v.

26 J. VANGILDER, et al.,  
27 Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-1330-HSG (PR)

Re: Dkt. No. 27

28

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1           The order entered on September 27, 2016 is vacated and replaced with the following order:

2           Good cause appearing, the above-referenced cases are related and the Clerk shall reassign  
3 case numbers C 16-0869 JST (PR), C 16-1320 MEJ (PR); and C 16-1330 NJV (PR) to the  
4 undersigned.

5           The parties are instructed that all future filings in any reassigned case are to bear the  
6 initials of the newly assigned judge (“HSG”) after the case number.

7           The dispositive motion briefing schedules currently set in *Cisneros v. Vangilder, et al.*, No.  
8 C 16-0735 HSG (PR) and *Chaidez v. Vangilder, et al.*, No. C 16-1330 NJV (PR) are VACATED.  
9 The Court will set a new briefing schedule after the operative complaints in *Falla v. Ducart, et al.*,  
10 No. C 16-0869 JST (PR) and *Manriquez v. Vangilder, et al.*, No. C 16-1320 MEJ (PR) are  
11 screened and served.

12           Defendants’ motion to consolidate the cases for all purposes is DENIED without prejudice.  
13 Although the cases involve common questions of law and/or fact, they do not present identical  
14 claims. Further, as noted above, two of the cases have not yet been screened and thus are at  
15 different stages of litigation. Finally, given that the cases were separately brought by four  
16 different inmates, all proceeding *pro se*, consolidation poses a risk of confusion to plaintiffs. The  
17 relation of the cases avoids the possibility of conflicting decisions and serves the interest of  
18 judicial economy, and the Court intends to set the same dispositive motion deadline for all four  
19 cases. Any further benefit from consolidation would be minimal. Accordingly, there will be no  
20 lead case, and the cases shall continue to proceed under their separate case numbers. Should the  
21 circumstances of the cases materially change, defendants’ may re-file their motion to consolidate.

22           Plaintiff Manriquez’s application for an extension of time to oppose defendants’ motion to  
23 consolidate is DENIED as moot.

24           Good cause appearing, plaintiff Chaidez’s application for a 30-day extension of time to  
25 make corrections to his deposition transcript is GRANTED.

26           //

27           //

28           //

This order terminates Docket Nos. 21 and 28 in Case No. C 16-cv-0735, Docket No. 18 in Case No. C 16-cv-1320, and Docket No. 27 in Case No. C 16-cv-1330.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 19, 2016

Haywood S. Gilliam Jr.  
HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
United States District Judge

United States District Court  
Northern District of California